UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,323	08/22/2003	Mark Smolenski	00601-0044US	9692
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET			EXAMINER	
			BATSON, VICTOR D	
SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3677	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/646,323	   SMOLENSKI E <sup>-</sup>	T AL.			
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner	Art Unit				
	VICTOR BATSON	3677				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app			ldress			
This application is abandoned in view of:						
Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office     (a) ☐ A reply was received on (with a Certificate of Note period for reply (including a total extension of time of (b) ☒ A proposed reply was received on 11/13/2007, but it rejection.	Mailing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on	·•				
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).						
(c) ☐ A reply was received on but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).						
(d) ☐ No reply has been received.						
2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8)  (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was	35). s received on (with a Certifica	ate of Mailing or Tr	ransmission dated			
), which is after the expiration of the statutory p Allowance (PTOL-85).	eriod for payment of the issue fee (ar	id publication fee) s	set in the Notice of			
(b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance						
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$						
(c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.						
3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).						
(a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.						
(b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.						
4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants.	e attorney or agent of record, the ass	ignee of the entire i	interest, or all of			
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by ar 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.	n attorney or agent (acting in a repres	entative capacity u	nder 37 CFR			
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interfer of the decision has expired and there are no allowed clair	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	e the period for see	eking court review			
7. 🛮 The reason(s) below:						
See Continuation Sheet						
/Victor Batson/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3677	Victor Batson SPE Art Unit: 3677					
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.						
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-1432 (Rev. 04-01)  Notice	of Abandonment	Part of Pa	per No. 20100426			

Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: This notice is also in response to the Request for status of Application (Status Inquiry) filed 1/26/2009, 11/25/2008, & 06/06/2008. In the status inquiries, applicant states that he was advised over the telephone by examiner Rodriguez that the application was allowed, however examiner Rodriguez no longer works at the Office. A review of the record does not indicate that an interview took place, that an agreement was reached or that an allowance was indicated. A search & inquiry was made to determine if examiner Rodriguez left any working folders, but none were found. The primary examiner working with examiner Rodriguez was consulted, however he was not aware of an allowance agreement. The final correspondence from examiner Rodriguez was an Advisory Action mailed 12/10/2007 indicating that the proposed amendment filed 11/13/2007 would not be entered because it raised new issues. Therefore, in view of the last correspondence from the Office (Advisory Action filed 12/10/2007), and the fact that applicant's period for reply has expired, the current status of the application is that the application is abandoned.